

September 13, 2012

Washington, D.C. —During his House floor speech supporting H.R. 6365, the National Security and Job Protection Act, Representative James Lankford (R-OK) was discouraged by a lack of presidential leadership in avoiding the sequester that looms at the beginning of 2013.

H.R. 6365 eliminates the sequester and achieves the same savings over five years. It reduces the FY13 discretionary spending cap by \$19.1 billion to \$1,028 billion. The bill also requires the President to submit legislation to Congress by October 15th, 2012, to provide details on his proposed spending cuts over the five-year period.

To watch a video of the speech, [click here](#).

A transcript of the speech follows:

“Let’s review. We have \$16 trillion in debt, and it’s climbing every single day. We have no budget from the Senate for the last three years. The President’s budget got exactly zero votes in the House AND in the Senate. The federal government has dramatically increased spending, which has led to this spending-driven crisis. Let me show you what I mean by that.

Five years ago in 2007, the federal treasury received \$2.5 trillion in revenue—the same amount that’s estimated to come in this year in revenue. \$2.5 trillion five years ago, \$2.5 trillion now. Five years ago, the total spent by the federal government: \$2.7 trillion. Now, \$3.7 trillion. That almost looks like a trillion-dollar difference in spending, which equals the same amount as our deficit. It’s amazing to me. When we process through this, the problem is crystal clear. It’s just the solution that seems to evade us in this process.

Now, some would say tell ya what we need to do, we’ve increased spending a trillion dollars, let’s just increase taxes as well and that’ll solve the issue. I would say, ‘Why are we spending money we don’t have?’ Last summer, we agreed that we would cut some spending and put a

group of people together in a room and let them work out a plan to find a trillion dollars in cuts. The backup—the emergency backup—was that we would cut across the board, if a solution wasn't found. Ten percent for security, eight percent for everything else.

Now, no one wants across-the-board cuts that are that huge. A one percent cut in agencies would be no big deal. I can't imagine any agency that couldn't handle one percent. Two percent, no big deal. Maybe even three percent, but you start to climb up, and it really begins to cut some agencies that are actually very efficient. Other agencies, you could do a fifty percent cut, and it would be fine. The problem is that an across-the-board cut becomes a very big issue for us. Treating every line item the same is a mistake. Every part is not the same in our budget. Let me give you an example.

At my house on a Saturday afternoon, I'll open up a Dr. Pepper can at my house and my very cute, redheaded, 12-year old daughter will walk up and say, 'Daddy, can we split that?' I will almost always smile at her and say, 'Sure. I'll take the liquid, you take the can—we'll split it even.' To which, she says to me, 'That's not really fair.'

But it again comes back to the same point: not all parts are the same. If we do across-the-board cuts in every area, that is not the best way to do it. Now, I guarantee you, you allow this House to go item-by-item through this budget; we will find \$100 billion in cuts next year. I guarantee you, but doing it across the board cuts into FBI, it cuts into our defense, it cuts into border patrol. It cuts into the basics and the heart of what we're doing, and we cannot do that.

The House passed a very specific plan for dealing with this last May. It is complete for us. Now, it's time for the Senate to actually do their job, and it's time for the President to send that over to us."

###

Contact: [Kelly Ferguson](#) 202.225.2132